



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

July 23, 2015

Mr. Leonard V. Schneider  
Counsel for City of Huntsville  
Liles Parker, P.L.L.C.  
800 Rockmead Drive, Suite 165  
Kingwood, Texas 77339

OR2015-15048

Dear Mr. Schneider:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under the Public Information Act (the "Act"), chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 570970.

The City of Huntsville (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for (1) a copy of all checks or documents related to transactions between the Federal Emergency Management Agency and the city; (2) copies of the completed designs of a specified project; (3) copies of inventories of all trees in a specified area; and (4) copies of all correspondence between specified parties in regards to a specified project.<sup>1</sup> You state you do not have some information responsive to the request.<sup>2</sup> You claim the submitted information is excepted

---

<sup>1</sup>We note we asked the city to provide additional information pursuant to section 552.303 of the Government Code. *See* Gov't Code § 552.303(c)-(d) (if attorney general determines that information in addition to that required by section 552.301 is necessary to render decision, written notice of that fact shall be given to governmental body and requestor, and governmental body shall submit necessary additional information to attorney general not later than seventh calendar day after date of receipt of notice). We have received and considered the correspondence sent by the city pursuant to that request.

<sup>2</sup>The Act does not require a governmental body to release information that did not exist when it received a request, create responsive information, or obtain information that is not held by the governmental body or on its behalf. *See Economic Opportunities Dev. Corp. v. Bustamante*, 562 S.W.2d 266 (Tex. Civ. App.—San Antonio 1978, writ dismissed); Open Records Decision Nos. 605 at 2 (1992), 555 at 1 (1990), 452 at 3 (1986), 362 at 2 (1983).

from disclosure under sections 552.103 and 552.107 of the Government Code.<sup>3</sup> We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.<sup>4</sup>

Initially, we note some of the submitted information is subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code, which provides in pertinent part:

(a) [T]he following categories of information are public information and not excepted from required disclosure unless made confidential under this chapter or other law:

...

(3) information in an account, voucher, or contract relating to the receipt or expenditure of public or other funds by a governmental body; [and]

...

(5) all working papers, research material, and information used to estimate the need for or expenditure of public funds or taxes by a governmental body, on completion of the estimate[.]

Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(3), (5). This information must be released unless it is confidential under the Act or other law. Although you assert this information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.103, this section is discretionary and does not make information confidential under the Act. *See Dallas Area Rapid Transit v. Dallas Morning News*, 4 S.W.3d 469, 475-76 (Tex. App.—Dallas 1999, no pet.) (governmental body may waive section 552.103); Open Records Decision No. 542 at 4 (1990) (statutory predecessor to section 552.103 may be waived); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally). Therefore, the city may not withhold the information subject to section 552.022(a)(3) or section 552.022(a)(5) under section 552.103. However,

---

<sup>3</sup>Although you raise section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 552.107 of the Government Code and Texas Rule of Evidence 503, this office has concluded section 552.101 does not encompass discovery privileges or other exceptions found in the Act. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 676 at 1-2 (2002), 575 at 2 (1990). Moreover, although you also raise Texas Rule of Evidence 503, we note the proper exception to raise when asserting the attorney-client privilege for information not subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code is section 552.107 of the Government Code. *See* ORD 676 at 1-2.

<sup>4</sup>We assume the “representative sample” of records submitted to this office is truly representative of the requested records as a whole. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 499 (1988), 497 (1988). This open records letter does not reach, and therefore does not authorize the withholding of, any other requested records to the extent that those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

we note the documents contain information that is subject to section 552.136 of the Government Code, which makes information confidential under the Act.<sup>5</sup> Thus, we will address the applicability of section 552.136 for this information. Moreover, we will consider your argument under section 552.103 for the information that is not subject to section 552.022(a)(3) or section 552.022(a)(5) of the Government Code.

Section 552.107(1) of the Government Code protects information coming within the attorney-client privilege. When asserting the attorney-client privilege, a governmental body has the burden of providing the necessary facts to demonstrate the elements of the privilege in order to withhold the information at issue. Open Records Decision No. 676 at 6-7 (2002). First, a governmental body must demonstrate that the information constitutes or documents a communication. *Id.* at 7. Second, the communication must have been made “to facilitate the rendition of professional legal services” to the client governmental body. TEX. R. EVID. 503(b)(1). The privilege does not apply when an attorney or representative is involved in some capacity other than that of providing or facilitating professional legal services to the client governmental body. *In re Tex. Farmers Ins. Exch.*, 990 S.W.2d 337, 340 (Tex. App.—Texarkana 1999, orig. proceeding) (attorney-client privilege does not apply if attorney acting in a capacity other than that of attorney). Governmental attorneys often act in capacities other than that of professional legal counsel, such as administrators, investigators, or managers. Thus, the mere fact that a communication involves an attorney for the government does not demonstrate this element. Third, the privilege applies only to communications between or among clients, client representatives, lawyers, and lawyer representatives. TEX. R. EVID. 503(b)(1)(A)-(E). Thus, a governmental body must inform this office of the identities and capacities of the individuals to whom each communication at issue has been made. Lastly, the attorney-client privilege applies only to a *confidential* communication, *id.* 503(b)(1), meaning it was “not intended to be disclosed to third persons other than those: (A) to whom disclosure is made to further the rendition of professional legal services to the client; or (B) reasonably necessary to transmit the communication.” *Id.* 503(a)(5). Whether a communication meets this definition depends on the *intent* of the parties involved at the time the information was communicated. *Osborne v. Johnson*, 954 S.W.2d 180, 184 (Tex. App.—Waco 1997, orig. proceeding). Moreover, because the client may elect to waive the privilege at any time, a governmental body must explain that the confidentiality of a communication has been maintained. Section 552.107(1) generally excepts an entire communication that is demonstrated to be protected by the attorney-client privilege unless otherwise waived by the governmental body. *See Huie v. DeShazo*, 922 S.W.2d 920, 923 (Tex. 1996) (privilege extends to entire communication, including facts contained therein).

---

<sup>5</sup>The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

You assert the information you marked consists of communications between the city attorney and city staff. You further state the communications were made for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services to the city, and the confidentiality of the communications has been maintained. Based on these representations and our review, we find the city may withhold the information you have marked in the indicated folder under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.<sup>6</sup>

Section 552.103 of the Government Code provides, in relevant part, the following:

(a) Information is excepted from [required public disclosure] if it is information relating to litigation of a civil or criminal nature to which the state or a political subdivision is or may be a party or to which an officer or employee of the state or a political subdivision, as a consequence of the person's office or employment, is or may be a party.

...

(c) Information relating to litigation involving a governmental body or an officer or employee of a governmental body is excepted from disclosure under Subsection (a) only if the litigation is pending or reasonably anticipated on the date that the requestor applies to the officer for public information for access to or duplication of the information.

Gov't Code § 552.103(a), (c). A governmental body claiming section 552.103 has the burden of providing relevant facts and documents to show the section 552.103(a) exception is applicable in a particular situation. The test for meeting this burden is showing (1) litigation is pending or reasonably anticipated on the date the governmental body received the request, and (2) the information at issue is related to that litigation. *Univ. of Tex. Law Sch. v. Tex. Legal Found.*, 958 S.W.2d 479, 481 (Tex. App.—Austin 1997, orig. proceeding); *Heard v. Houston Post Co.*, 684 S.W.2d 210, 212 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] 1984, writ ref'd n.r.e.); Open Records Decision No. 551 at 4 (1990). The governmental body must meet both prongs of this test for information to be excepted under section 552.103(a).

To establish litigation is reasonably anticipated, a governmental body must provide this office with “concrete evidence showing that the claim that litigation may ensue is more than mere conjecture.” Open Records Decision No. 452 at 4 (1986). Whether litigation is reasonably anticipated must be determined on a case-by-case basis. *See id.* Concrete evidence to support a claim that litigation is reasonably anticipated may include, for example, the governmental body's receipt of a letter containing a specific threat to sue the

---

<sup>6</sup>As our ruling is dispositive as to the information at issue, we need not address your remaining argument against disclosure.

governmental body from an attorney for a potential opposing party.<sup>7</sup> *See* Open Records Decision No. 555 (1990); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 518 at 5 (1989) (litigation must be “realistically contemplated”). On the other hand, this office has determined if an individual publicly threatens to bring suit against a governmental body, but does not actually take objective steps toward filing suit, litigation is not reasonably anticipated. *See* Open Records Decision No. 331 (1982).

You assert the city reasonably anticipated litigation when it received the request for information because, prior to the date the city received the present request for information, the city received from the requestor written and verbal threats to sue the city on matters related to the submitted information. You also contend the city reasonably anticipates the requestor will carry through his threats because he has previously sued the city on other unrelated environmental issues. However, you do not inform our office that, at the time the city received the present request, anyone had taken any concrete steps toward the initiation of litigation against the city regarding this matter. Consequently, we find you have failed to demonstrate the city reasonably anticipated litigation when it received the present request for information. As such, we conclude the city may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.103 of the Government Code.

We note portions of the remaining information are subject to section 552.136 of the Government Code. Section 552.136 of the Government Code states, “Notwithstanding any other provision of this chapter, a credit card, debit card, charge card, or access device number that is collected, assembled, or maintained by or for a governmental body is confidential.” Gov’t Code § 552.136(b); *see also id.* § 552.136(a) (defining “access device”). Accordingly, the city must withhold the bank account and routing numbers we have marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code.

We note the remaining information includes an e-mail address of a member of the public that is subject to section 552.137 of the Government Code. Section 552.137 excepts from disclosure “an e-mail address of a member of the public that is provided for the purpose of communicating electronically with a governmental body,” unless the member of the public consents to its release or the e-mail address is of a type specifically excluded by subsection (c). *Id.* § 552.137(a)-(c). The e-mail address we have marked is not the type specifically excluded by section 552.137(c). *See id.* § 552.137(c). Accordingly, the city must withhold the e-mail address we have marked under section 552.137, unless the owner of the address affirmatively consents to its release.

---

<sup>7</sup>In addition, this office has concluded litigation was reasonably anticipated when the potential opposing party took the following objective steps toward litigation: filed a complaint with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, *see* Open Records Decision No. 336 (1982); hired an attorney who made a demand for disputed payments and threatened to sue if the payments were not made promptly, *see* Open Records Decision No. 346 (1982); and threatened to sue on several occasions and hired an attorney, *see* Open Records Decision No. 288 (1981).

In summary, the city may withhold the information you have marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. The city must withhold the bank account and routing numbers we have marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code. The city must withhold the e-mail address we have marked under section 552.137, unless the owner affirmatively consents to its release. The remaining information must be released.<sup>8</sup>

This letter ruling is limited to the particular information at issue in this request and limited to the facts as presented to us; therefore, this ruling must not be relied upon as a previous determination regarding any other information or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For more information concerning those rights and responsibilities, please visit our website at [http://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open/orl\\_ruling\\_info.shtml](http://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open/orl_ruling_info.shtml), or call the Office of the Attorney General's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable charges for providing public information under the Act may be directed to the Office of the Attorney General, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,



Mili Gosar  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

MG/cbz

Ref: ID# 570970

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)

---

<sup>8</sup>We note the requestor has a right of access to his own personal e-mail address in the information that is being released. See Gov't Code § 552.137(b) (personal e-mail address of member of public may be disclosed if owner of address affirmatively consents to its disclosure).